





**Approval Of Title II Research Awards Relating To The Effects Of  
Implementing California's Credentialing Reforms Pursuant To The  
Provisions Of SB 2042**

**Professional Services Division  
February 6, 2002**

**Executive Summary**

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved new Standards under SB 2042 for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs; at its meeting of October 4, 2001, the Commission approved new Blended Program Standards under SB 2042; and at its meeting of November 8, 2001, the Commission approved grants under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant to institutions that wanted to be "Early Adopters" of the new standards.

In March 2002, the Commission approved new Professional Teacher Induction Standards under SB 2042, and in September 2002 it adopted Assessment Quality Standards for Teaching Performance Assessment. Teacher preparation, subject matter preparation, and teacher induction programs are all currently in the process of implementing these new standards. In keeping with the Commission's objective of monitoring and reporting on the outcome of new program initiatives, it is appropriate at this point in the standards process to take a closer look at the effects of implementing California's new credentialing standards from a statewide perspective.

This agenda item describes research awards to be made under California's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant for the purpose of conducting research on the effects of implementing California's credentialing standards pursuant to SB 2042.

**Fiscal Impact Summary**

The research awards will be funded entirely from the federal Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant.

**Policy Issues To Be Decided**

Should the Commission approve the Title II planning research awards to monitor and report on the effects of the implementation of California's credentialing standards pursuant to SB 2042?

**Recommendation**

Staff recommend that the Commission approve the Title II research awards to monitor and report on the effects of the implementation of California's credentialing standards pursuant to SB 2042.



# **Approval Of Title II Research Awards Relating To The Effects Of Implementing California's Credentialing Reforms Pursuant To The Provisions Of SB 2042**

**Professional Services Division  
February 6, 2003**

## **I. Background Information**

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved new Standards under SB 2042 for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs; at its meeting of October 4, 2001, the Commission approved new Blended Program Standards under SB 2042; and at its meeting of November 8, 2001, the Commission approved grants under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant to institutions that wanted to be "Early Adopters" of the new standards.

In March 2002, the Commission approved new Professional Teacher Induction Standards under SB 2042, and in September 2002, the Commission adopted Assessment Quality Standards for Teaching Performance Assessment. Teacher preparation, subject matter preparation, and teacher induction programs are all currently in the process of implementing these new standards. In keeping with the Commission's objective of monitoring and reporting on the outcome of new program initiatives, it is appropriate at this point in the standards process to take a closer look at the effects of implementing California's new credentialing standards from a statewide perspective.

The approved Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant Work Plan for the 2002-03 year included a specific line item to fund research studies on the effects of implementing California's new credentialing standards on a statewide basis. Since 2002-2003 is the final year of funding for the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, and as the Early Adopter programs have begun operation while other programs are already well into planning for their transition to the new standards and are submitting program documents to the Commission, it is timely to begin the research process now. For this purpose, a Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued by the Commission in early December 2002.

## **II. The Title II Research Awards RFP Process**

**A. Issuance of the RFP:** An RFP was issued on December 2, 2002, and was also posted in the California Contracts Register. Potential applicants were requested to submit an Intent to Bid, although it was not mandatory to do so in order to submit a full response to the RFP. A total of 12 intents to bid were received by the time of preparation of this agenda narrative.

Applicants were informed that (a) the RFP was for the purpose of providing research-based information about the effects of implementing California's credentialing reforms pursuant to the provisions of SB 2042; (b) funding for this activity would come from California's HEA Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, and would be subject to federal provisions governing the allowable uses of HEA Title II funds; (c) a total of \$300,000 would be available to support

proposed research activities; and (d) all activities conducted under grants using HEA Title II funds must be completed by August 31, 2003.

**B. Eligible Applicants for the Research Awards:** Those eligible to apply for the Title II Research Awards were: (a) Institutions of higher education, individually and/or in consortium; (b) Independent research organizations, companies and/or individuals; and (c) LEAs in consortium with IHEs and/or independent research organizations, companies, and/or individuals.

**C. Deadline for Receipt of Applications:** The deadline for receipt of applications at the Commission's office was at 5:00 p.m. on January 15, 2003.

**D. Funding for the Research Awards:** A total of \$300,000 in federal funds through California's HEA Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State grant was available for this competition. The estimated average size of a grant award was expected to be \$100,000; however, applicants could propose a budget of more than the average expected award depending on the scope and significance of the proposed work.

**E. Competitive Priority Area for Research Awards:** The RFP indicated that the Commission was particularly interested in receiving proposals that addressed the following competitive priority, and that it was expected that at least one award would be made in this category: *Survey research on the SB 2042 implementation process within subject matter preparation, professional teacher preparation and/or professional teacher induction institutions and programs. Proposals must address subject matter preparation and professional teacher preparation at a minimum.*

Additional guidance to applicants was provided within the RFP to indicate that within this competitive priority, the Commission was interested in a systematic analysis of (a) how individuals involved with the SB 2042 reforms experienced the process of implementing the credentialing reforms, and information on the impacts of these reforms at institutions of higher education and/or local school districts, (b) the impacts of this reform on programs and curricula within teacher education and on the larger organizational structures that house credential programs; (c) the impacts of this reform on institutional practices (e.g., faculty development, candidate assessments, resource allocation) beyond program design and curriculum changes, and (d) the impacts of this reform on local educational systems and other external partners.

**F. Other Priority Areas for Research Awards: Potential** applicants were also advised that the Commission was also interested in receiving proposals that addressed the following invitational priorities: (a) *the impact of the SB 2042 credentialing reforms on the quality and the effectiveness of professional teacher preparation from subject matter preparation through initial teacher preparation and induction; and (b) the impact of the SB 2042 credentialing reforms on the teacher workforce (i.e., retention and distribution).*

For invitational priority (a), the Commission was interested in obtaining research designs that could yield evidence-based conclusions on the impacts of the SB 2042 credentialing reforms on the quality and effectiveness of California teachers, including effects on student achievement; and on the outcomes of the SB 2042 credentialing reforms in terms of structural and/or programmatic changes in the professional preparation and induction of California teachers.

For invitational priority (b), the Commission was interested in obtaining research designs that could yield evidence-based conclusions on the degree to which the SB 2042 credentialing reforms have affected teacher retention rates and qualified teacher workforce distribution within the state.

Applicants were also allowed to propose for consideration research topics related to the SB 2042 credentialing reforms other than the ones identified in the priority areas.

### III. The Title II Research Awards Application Review Process

A team of qualified peer reviewers met at the Commission office on January 16, 2003, to review and rate the applications received. The following criteria were used in reviewing each application:

#### **PROPOSAL REVIEW CRITERIA**

##### **Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part I**

Proposal Sponsor: \_\_\_\_\_

##### **Compliance with Proposal Requirements**

Commission staff will indicate whether or not each of the following criteria is met by checking “yes” or “no” in the appropriate space. *Proposals lacking one or more of the following requirements will be rejected without further evaluation.*

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Proposal was received at or before 5:00 p.m., at the office of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Four complete copies of the proposal were received.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ The cover page of the proposal identifies the applicant and includes an appropriate signature.

As described in Part Two of the RFP, the proposal has the following required elements, each organized as required, and with the required information.

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Cover Page

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Table of Contents

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Section 1: Identification and Description of the Proposed Area of Research

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Section 2: Literature Review

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Section 3: Description of the Research Team

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Section 4: Description of the Activities to be conducted under this Grant

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Section 5: Project Budget

**Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part II  
Criteria for the Evaluation of Proposals**

	<u>Maximum Score</u>
(1) <u>Proposed Area(s) of Research</u> . The applicant possesses expertise in all areas essential to the project. Responses to the Competitive Priority will receive a maximum of 10 additional points in this category.	20 (plus a possible 10)
(2) <u>Literature Review</u> . The proposal provides a comprehensive review and summary of applicable literature in the field.	10
(3) <u>Project Research Team</u> . The proposal demonstrates that the applicant has (a) experience and expertise in conducting research in the fields of teacher licensure, K-12 education, or another related field, and (b) sufficient resources to conduct the proposed activities with high quality within the proposed timeline.	35
(4) <u>Description of the Research Activities</u> . The proposal includes a well-organized, feasible plan for managing and staffing the project. Key duties would be assigned to individuals with essential expertise, experience, and time to complete their responsibilities.	30
(5) <u>Project Costs</u> . The costs proposed by the applicant are reasonable in relation to the proposed activities and/or products.	5
<b>Maximum Possible Score</b>	<b>110</b>

**IV. Applications Received and Recommended Awards**

Applications were received from:

- California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
- California State University, Los Angeles/ Program Evaluation and Research Collaborative (PERC)
- California State University, Sacramento Foundation



- Educational System Planning
- ESC Management Solutions
- Innovative Strategies
- Insight Education Group
- MGT of America
- Public Works
- San Diego County Office of Education
- Sinclair Research Group
- University of California, Santa Cruz

The following are the recommended awards for the Title II Research contracts:

- **California State University, Los Angeles/Program Evaluation and Research Collaborative (PERC) -- \$125,000**  
California State University, Los Angeles/PERC, responded to the Competitive Priority. Within the contract period, CSULA will conduct survey research on the following topics: (a) how the individuals involved with the SB 2042 reform experienced the process of implementing the reforms; (b) what the impacts were of this reform on programs and on curricula; the impact of the reform on institutional practices; and the impacts on local educational systems and other external partners. The time frame for this contract will be from February 2003 through August 31, 2003.
- **California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo --\$110,691**  
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo responded to the Invitational Priority focused on the impacts of the SB 2042 reform on the teacher workforce. Within the contract period, CSU San Luis Obispo will develop a fully-articulated research design that addresses the following research questions: (a) Once teachers have completed their preparation programs, how long do teachers remain in the profession? What factors lead to retention (such as attrition, re-entry and other factors)? (b) Where are teachers employed? What factors characterize this employment? What factors affect stability and mobility? The time frame for this contract will be from February 2003 through August 31, 2003.

